IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONORABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.H.L.DATTU
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.T.SANKARAN

TUESDAY, THE 24TH JULY 2007 / 2ND SRAVANA 1929

Con.Case(C).No. 1625 of 2004(S)

ARISING OUT OF THE JUDGEMENT IN WPC.33426/2004 Dated 24/11/2004
.....

PETITIONERS:
---

1. K. RAMANAN, S/O. KARUNAKARAN,
   AGED 56 YEARS, PARENT OF NIVEDA VINOD,
   STD IV, KAMYAKOM, MAROTTICHUVADU,
   SANTHI NAGAR, EDAPPALLY.

2. SIJO T. GEORGE, S/O. N.C. GEORGE,
   AGED 32 YEARS, PARENT OF SUSANNA SIJO,
   STD.1, MUTHUKKATTU HOUSE, KOTHAMANGALAM.

3. E.D. OMANA, W/O. T.M.JACOB,
   AGED 43 YEARS, MOTHER OF ARUN JACOB,
   STD.XI, THAYIL HOUSE, MAMANGALAM,
   PALARIVATTOM P.O., KOCHI-25.

4. MRS. CICY J. ANTONY,
   W/O. ANTONY T. PIAS, AGED 55 YEARS
   MOTHER OF TEENA ROSE ANTONY, STD.XI,
   AND TINA ELIZABETH ANTONY, STD.X,
   HOUSE NO.49/2116 F, CENTER PARK,
   PONNICHIRA ROAD, EDAPPALLY, KOCHI.

BY ADV. SRI.K.RAMAKUMAR
SRI.T.RAMPRASAD UNNI

RESPONDENT:

SRI.P.K. SAJEEVAN, FATHER'S NAME AND
AGE NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONRS, ADVOCATE
PADUTHOLI HOUSE, PRASANTHI NAGAR ROAD,
EDAPPALLY.

BY SRI.P.SREEKUMAR

THIS CONTEMPT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 24/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

H.L.DATTU, C.J. & K.T.SANKARAN, J.

Cont.Case (C)No.1625 of 2004

Dated, this the 24th day of July, 2007

JUDGMENT

H.L.Dattu, C.J.

Alleging that the respondent has violated the orders passed by this Court in W.P.(C) No.33426 of 2004 dated 24th November, 2004, the complainant is before us in this contempt petition.

2. The order passed by this Court reads as under:

> "This is a petition filed for police protection. On 17.11.2004 we passed the following order:-
>
> 'Urgent notice by special messenger. Police to see that there is no obstruction to the ingress and egress to the school. Police also should see that studies in the petitioner's school shall not be disrupted and school buses are not obstructed for a period of 10 days'.
>
> It is submitted by counsel for the 4th respondent that they are not making any obstructions as alleged in the Writ Petition. That submission is recorded. In the above circumstances police is directed to give protection as and when required.
>
> The writ petition is disposed of as above."

3. In the petition it is alleged that the respondent has disobeyed the orders and directions issued by this Court wilfully, intentionally, purposely deliberately, etc.

4. Having gone through the pleadings and having seen the orders passed by the learned Judges of this Court, at this length of time, in our

opinion, it may not be necessary for us to take cognizance of the complaint filed by the complainant. Therefore, the contempt proceedings are dropped for the present.

Ordered accordingly.

(**H.L.DATTU)**
CHIEF JUSTICE

(K.T.SANKARAN)
JUDGE

vns